

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Francesco Marraffa,

Case No.: _____

Plaintiff,

v.

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL TO
FEDERAL COURT**

Talk About It Solutions, Inc., doing
business as Remooble, and Bart Engendahl,

Defendants.

To: Clerk of Court, United States District Court, District of Minnesota, 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 202, Minneapolis, MN 55415, and Plaintiff above-named.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE, that Defendants Talk About it Solutions, Inc., doing business as Remooble, and Bart Engendahl, by their undersigned attorney, remove this action from the District Court for the Fourth Judicial District for the State of Minnesota, Hennepin County, to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1367.

In support of its Notice of Removal, Defendants state the following:

1. On or about November 19, 2018, Plaintiff served a Summons and Complaint upon Defendants. (Exhibit A).
2. On or about December 7, 2018, Defendants served an Answer upon Plaintiff (Exhibit B).
3. Exhibits A and B constitute all process, pleadings, and orders in this action.

4. Consistent with 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b), this Notice of Removal is filed within thirty (30) days of service of the Summons and Compliant upon Defendants.

5. A Notice of Filing of Removal and a copy of this Notice of Removal to Federal Court are being contemporaneously filed herewith in the Minnesota District Court, Fourth Judicial District, Hennepin County, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d) and copies of the same have been served upon Plaintiff as verified by the attached Affidavit of Service.

JURISDICTION

6. Plaintiff's claims may be removed from the Minnesota District Court, Fourth Judicial District, Hennepin Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) because the District of Minnesota is the District embracing the place where the action is pending.

7. The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action constitutes a claim by Plaintiff for violation of federal statute. Plaintiffs specifically alleges a claim under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §201, *et seq.* (See Compl. ¶ 35, Exhibit A).

8. The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims in this action because those claims are closely related to and arise out of the same set of operative facts as the federal law claim. The supplemental jurisdiction statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) provides:

[I]n any civil action of which the district courts have original jurisdiction, the district courts shall have supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

9. Claims are “part of the same case or controversy.... if they “derive from a common nucleus of operative fact.” *ABF Freight Sys., Inc. v. Int’l Broth. Of Teamsters*, 645 F.3d 954, 963 (8th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Myers v. Richland Cnty*, 429 F.3d 740, 746 (8th Cir. 2005). Claims “derive from a common nucleus of operative fact if the ‘claims are such that [the plaintiff] would ordinarily be expected to try them all in one judicial proceedings.’” *Id.* (quoting *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 725 (1966)).

10. The supplemental jurisdiction statute is subject to certain enumerated exceptions which do not exist here.

11. In cases where federal question jurisdiction exists, federal courts have exercised supplemental jurisdiction over state law contract claims and claims under Minn. Stat. §181.13, such as those asserted by Plaintiff in this action. *See, e.g., Smith v. Local Union No. 110, Intern. Broth. of Elec. Workers*, 681 F.Supp.2d 995, 1000 (D. Minn. 2002); *McGoldrick v. DataTrak International, Inc.*, 42 F.Supp.2d 893, 897 (D. Minn. 1999).

12. Nothing in this Notice of Removal should be construed as a waiver of any defenses by Defendants.

13. If any question arises as to the propriety of the removal of this action, Defendants respectfully request the opportunity to brief any disputed issues and to present oral argument in support of their position that this case is properly removable.

WHEREFORE, Defendants Talk About it Solutions, Inc., doing business as Remooble, and Bart Engendahl hereby move this action from the District Court for the Fourth Judicial District, Hennepin County, Minnesota, to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, and requests that this Court take jurisdiction of this action to the exclusion of any further proceedings in State Court.

GRAY, PLANT, MOOTY,
MOOTY & BENNETT, P.A.

Dated: December 7, 2018

By s/ Tara Craft Adams
Tara Craft Adams (#332409)
Email: tara.adams@gpmlaw.com

500 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 632-3000

**ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANTS
TALK ABOUT IT SOLUTIONS, INC.,
DOING BUSINESS AS REMOUBLE,
AND BART ENGENDAHL**